

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed February 4, 2008. Claim 19 has been amended. Support for currently amended claim 19 can be found throughout the specification as originally filed, for example, in the Examples. Claims 19 and 23-30 will remain pending upon entry of the instant amendment.

No new matter has been added. Amendments and/or cancellation of the claims should in no way be construed as an acquiescence to any of the Examiner's objections and/or rejections. Amendments and/or cancellations of the claims are being made solely to expedite prosecution of the above-identified application. Applicants reserve the right to prosecute the same or similar claims in the present or another patent application. The amendments and/or cancellations made are not related to any issues of patentability.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Carlson et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,432,906)

The Office Action rejected claims 19, 23-24, 26-28 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Carlson et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Office Action states that Carlson et al. teaches an acid cleaner composition comprising at least 5 wt% of a normally liquid acid and at least 5 wt% of a normally solid acid, an effective solidifying amount of a urea compound and about 5 to 10 wt% of water, wherein the acid block cleaner composition is solidified and held in a disposable plastic container. The Office Action acknowledges however, that Carlson et al. fails to disclose that the composition comprises water in the amounts recited in the claimed invention. The Office Action states though that it would have been obvious to optimize the proportions of the water of Carlson et al. through routine experimentation for best results. Applicants respectfully disagree.

The presently claimed invention is directed to an acidic cleaning block *that is not a paste* comprising citric acid, at least two acids selected from adipic, succinic, glutaric and mixtures thereof, at least 3% and up to 20% by weight of water. Applicants respectfully submit that Carlson et al. does not teach or suggest such a cleaning block. Nor has the Office Action pointed to anything in the art generally that teaches or suggests the presently claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Carlson et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,432,906) in view of Morelli et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,524,624)

The Office Action rejected claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Carlson et al. in view of Morelli et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As discussed above, Applicants submit that Carlson et al. fails to teach or suggest the presently claimed invention. Morelli et al. does not remedy this shortcoming. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Carlson et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,432,906) in view of Mandler et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,573,698)

The Office Action rejected claim 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Carlson et al. in view of Mandler et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As discussed above, Applicants submit that Carlson et al. does not teach or suggest the presently claimed invention. Mandler et al. does not remedy this shortcoming. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Summary

It is respectfully submitted that each of the pending claims is in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is kindly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' primary attorney-of-record, Anneliese S. Mayer, at (651) 795-5661, if it is believed that prosecution of this application may be assisted thereby.



Respectfully submitted,

ECOLAB INC.
Law Department
Mail Stop ESC-F7
655 Lone Oak Drive
Eagan, Minnesota 55121
Phone Number: (651) 795-5661
Fax Number: (651) 204-7507

Dated: June 4, 2008

By: /Anneliese S. Mayer/
Name: Anneliese S. Mayer
Reg. No. 54,434